REMARKS

Entry of this amendment is requested.

The restriction requirement required election between Groups III and IV. Applicants elected Group III. Upon reconsideration; however, it is believed that the restriction between Groups III and IV is improper, and is traversed.

As this supplemental paper was filed one working day after the original election, no hardship on the USPTO results herefrom, and inclusion in the election is proper.

The sole basis for alleging distinction between Groups III and IV is

> "they differ in objectives, method steps, reagents, and/or dosages and/ors schedules used, response variables and criteria for success."

This boiler plate is irrelevant and incorrect. The objective is the same: the identification of expression of molecules associated with cancer. The method steps and criteria for success are the same. The references to dosages and/or schedules makes no sense. No such criteria are in the claims.

It is pointed out that the USPTO has also taken the position that the nucleic acid molecules for SSX4 and SSX5 constitute a single invention, as do the proteins themselves. Reference is made to the issued parent and grandparent cases in this regard. There is compelling, PTO generated precedent, which cannot be ignored.

In view of this reconsideration of the restriction between Groups III and IV, and examination of all pending claims is believed proper and urged.

Respectfully submitted,

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI, L.L.P.

Norman D. Hanson, Esq.
Registration No. 30,946

666 Fifth Avenue
New York, New York 10103-3198
Telephone: 212-318-3168
Telecopier: 212-318-3400